

## Remarks/Arguments

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 6, 2003. Claims 2-11, 13, 15 and 17 have been canceled. Claims 1, 12 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 are pending. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under Sections 102(b) and 103 as being unpatentable over Jenkins. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The claims as presently presented contain numerous distinctions over Jenkins and all other cited references. First and foremost, Jenkins does not permit the two relatively-pivoting parts 14 and 18 to be moved "requiring no pre-manipulation of any portion of the lock prior to pivoting movement" as called for in Claim 1 and the other independent claims. To the contrary, Jenkins includes a complicated pin and slot arrangement, featuring elements 22, 36, 40 and 44, which requires the user to push part 18 inwardly before pivoting.

Moreover, Jenkins is not a hinge construction that includes two pivoting "leaves" as claimed in all Applicant's claims. Jenkins has a fixed socket 14 from which tab member 18 extends in one position and is enclosed in the other position.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 as amended is respectfully submitted to be patentable over Jenkins.

The remaining Claims 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 all contain specific structural limitations that are nowhere disclosed or suggested by any reference. For example, Claim 12 calls for "a central location located in abutting inner longitudinal edges of the leaves, and the cam and follower being located in the central location." There is nothing in Jenkins or any other reference even

remotely similar to this limitation in Claim 12. The other claims not discussed are similarly limited and distinguishable over the references, as is readily apparent.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for full allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner determine that an interview with the attorney in charge of this case would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues of patentability, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/20/2004



Daniel V. Thompson  
Registration 29,706  
Attorney for Applicant

Abrams Centre  
9330 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1185  
Dallas, Texas 75243  
(972) 479-0900